



**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL
AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF: MAY 21, 2002**

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2, AND ARE CLOSED CAPTIONED FOR OUR HEARING IMPAIRED VIEWERS. THE COUNCIL MEETING, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER KCLV PROGRAMMING, CAN BE VIEWED ON THE INTERNET AT www.kclv.tv. THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 AND THE WEB THURSDAY AT 5:00 AM, FRIDAY AT 8:00 PM AND SUNDAY AT 3:00 PM

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES:

PRESENT: MAYOR GOODMAN and COUNCIL MEMBERS REESE, M. McDONALD, BROWN, L.B. McDONALD, WEEKLY, and MACK

Also Present: CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL, CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC, and CHIEF CITY CLERK BEVERLY K. BRIDGES

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE – Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas Library, 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North

Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway

Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall

City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(9:10)

1-1

MAYOR GOODMAN led the audience in the Pledge.

(9:10)

1-18

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL
AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF: MAY 21, 2002

DEPARTMENT: FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES

DIRECTOR: MARK R. VINCENT

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Discussion and possible action regarding the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget as filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 15, 2002 and adoption of Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget, including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan, as amended with guidance from City Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget, including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan, as amended with guidance from City Council.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

FY2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget

1. Submitted at meeting: PowerPoint presentation of the Final Budget
2. Submitted at meeting: Capital Project Funding Allocation Worksheet

MOTION:

REESE – APPROVED as recommended to include changes on the allocation work sheet and to add as soon as possible four additional positions for Neighborhood Services with no net gain in the number of positions or the final budget amount - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

MAYOR GOODMAN declared the Public Hearing open.

CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE indicated that this budget hearing is the Council's last step in finalizing the City's budget for Fiscal-Year 2003. Staff incorporated Council's direction from the budget workshop into the final budget. Over the last four years the City has

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

modified its budget preparation process to integrate it with other planning processes, such as incorporating the Council's Strategic Planning Priorities into the budget resource allocation using activity costing methods to monitor both the revenue generation and operating costs of service delivery, as well as tracking their alignment with Council priorities. Starting with Fiscal-Year 2003 all departments will monitor their operations using this activity-based approach. Additionally, interactive spreadsheets have been developed to assist Council in determining the priorities of City facilities and parks projects. That interactive prioritization was incorporated into the budget workshop, thus ensuring the Council's guidance, which will be accurately expressed and reflected in the budget. These changes have not only provided for a more open and public budget process, but have also assured that the City makes sound budgetary decisions when faced with economic slowdowns arising from recession, workers strikes, legislative assessments or even terrorists attacks.

The proposed general fund expenditure budget for Fiscal Year 2003 represents a 3.5% increase over the estimate for Fiscal-Year 2002. Staff was able to realign resources with Council priorities by taking advantage of vacancy cost savings and eliminating 15 positions. This reduction resulted in a net increase of eight new non-public safety positions. The proposed budget will fund 98 new positions and eliminate 15 positions for a net increase of 83. Of those 83 positions, 75 are public safety positions. The Fire Safety Initiative Tax Override funds 63 of those positions.

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE introduced MARK VINCENT, Director, Finance and Business Services and CANDY FALDER, Budget Manager, who gave a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed Final Budget with incorporated changes made at the Budget Workshop of April 15, 2002. MR. VINCENT summarized that the City's budget for 2003 is slightly in a negative position as a result of funding the one-time retroactive adjustment for the firefighter contract when that finally comes to closure.

In discussing the General Fund Revenues, MR. VINCENT indicated that the forecast increase for consolidated tax revenues for the sales portion is 2.8% for next year, based on the State's projected growth. He presented a Property Tax Rate graph depicting statutory operating limits on what the City can levy for its operating tax rate and the levy that the City Council actually approved. From Fiscal Year 1994 through Fiscal Year 1997 it was the City's policy to go ahead with what the authorized limit allowed. For Fiscal Year 1998 there was a significant reduction in

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

the tax rate because the Council, at that time, approved about a 9% roll back in the property tax rate. In Fiscal Year 2002 the Debt Retirement saved the City \$.016 and at that time the Council took an action to increase the operating rate to \$.03. There was a net increase of about \$.014 and that revenue was used to fund the \$25 million Parks Bond Project. The new instituted budget policy states that the City will maintain a cushion between the levy authorized by State Statute and the actual levy of at least \$0.1120, which has been maintained. In fact, there has not been an operating increase since 2000 and the City is approximately \$0.17 below the state authorized levy. The City has been able to conduct business and fund programs without having a tax impact, other than the Fire Safety Initiative that the voters approved for the last several years.

MR. VINCENT pointed out the changes made during the Budget Workshop. He indicated that the final budget includes the construction of four new fire stations and funding for two extra crews. In addition, six new positions have been added. These six positions include the Victim Witness Advocate position, which in past years was funded by a grant. However, that grant has expired and the intention of the City was to eventually take over the financing of that position. Although the City reapplied for the grant, it was turned down. Other positions include the Management Analyst position in Neighborhood Services, which would primarily support some of the homeless programs, two maintenance workers that would take over additional maintenance responsibilities due to the swap of the facilities in Summerlin, and two Public Works positions for the Architectural Services Division. He explained that in the area of architectural services, construction and engineering office, organizations would be created that will begin having construction management resources that will be charging back construction projects starting in Fiscal-Year 2003.

According to a Public Works study, it was recommended that if the City had the resources, it could do the construction management far cheaper than it would cost to outsource those. By creating a mechanism that allows the City to charge out for those services, the City can create a pool of resources to be charged to the projects that they are supporting, such as the four fire stations under construction and an existing station that the Council allocated money to rebuild an existing station. The intention for these two positions, although they will be considered general fund positions, is that they would be charged to those capital project funds for the fire and rescue facilities. There is no net budgetary impact to the general fund. The funding that was allocated for this capital project is sufficient to pay for these salaries as they provide those services. When there is no need to build more fire stations, those resources could be charged to

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

other capital projects. Once those resources are no longer needed, those resources would have to either be reduced or reassigned elsewhere as vacancies occur. The intention is that these are not permanent positions, but positions that will remain as long as the demand is there.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD expressed concern about adding the management analyst position when there is a shortage of Code Enforcement Officers. He indicated that it took two months to have an action taken on a CAR (Council Action Request) he submitted about the removal of a tree from a senior citizen's yard. Focus should be given to removing the graffiti artists from older neighborhoods. He feels that Catholic Charities provides the same assistance that the two management analysts would provide. Taxpayers' money should go back to the taxpayers to provide services to benefit their neighborhoods. COUNCILMAN REESE pointed out that there is a growing graffiti problem, abandoned cars, and junkyards in his neighborhood as well. He has asked for four new positions in Neighborhood Services and asked DEPUTY CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL to explain what could be done regarding these positions. COUNCILMAN McDONALD asked that she also explain what happened to the two positions at the Belair office.

DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL explained that she spoke with SHARON SEGERBLOM, Director, Neighborhood Services, on how to best leverage the resources to address all the Council's desires, including addressing the graffiti issue, assign Code Enforcement Officers and a variety of other issues that are major concerns in some of the older areas of the City. In addition, the City Council adopted the new abandoned buildings and shopping cart ordinances, which will place additional demands on the Neighborhood Services Department function next year. If it is the Council's desire to create four positions in Neighborhood Services, she recommended that the Council establish the positions, but not fund them at this time. She would like to take a couple of weeks to meet with each of the Council members, together with MS. SEGERBLOM, and come up with a plan so that a number of positions are not created that may or may not address the concerns raised by the Council.

COUNCILMAN MACK echoed the sentiments of COUNCILMEN REESE and McDONALD, but added that the new areas are also being affected by graffiti and shopping cart problems. He indicated that he would like to take a look at the efficiency of that department and would be happy to sit down with DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL and MS. SEGERBLOM to see whether some of the department's functions could be privatized to address concerns, such as shopping carts. This could be outsourced so that City employees can concentrate on working more efficiently for the City of Las Vegas and its taxpayers.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD asked what would be the Management Analyst position's task and whether the position could be part of the equation as it relates to the MASH Center and the Crisis Intervention Center. She also asked how many senior analysts are currently in Neighborhood Services and if the resources in existence today could accomplish the analysis to be performed by the new Management Analyst position.

MAYOR GOODMAN verified that BILL ARENT would be going to the Office of Business Development. He has been primarily responsible for monitoring the homeless problem, as far as the City's role with the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition. He has been excellent in that position. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the promise was made to him that MR. ARENT would continue, notwithstanding the fact that he has been transferred from Neighborhood Services to the Office of Business Development, to fulfill that function. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL replied that MR. ARENT would continue with the homeless task force until his position could be filled. She clarified for MAYOR GOODMAN that the Management Analyst position being requested by the Neighborhood Services Department is to fill MR. ARENT'S position. MR. ARENT'S position is grant-funded and its focus is solely on housing related issues. There is a homeless nexus in those services in that there is emergency and transitional housing and permanent affordable housing. However, when MR. ARENT was assigned to the homeless effort, consideration was not given to the fact that a new major issue would arise. She explained that the Regional Planning Coalition Homeless Task Force is comprised of 11 members, with MAYOR GOODMAN as the Chairman. They meet on a monthly basis, and there is more responsibility on the City's part because the Mayor is the Chairman of the committee. Therefore, not only the City participates in the planning efforts, it also administers the entire committee's activities. MR. ARENT has been performing those duties and has kept him from being able to do his affordable housing duties. The City is faced with not only dealing with the Homeless Task Force coordination, but also with the MASH RFQ evaluation, and obtaining a new provider. In addition to the potential of having this homeless housing trust fund established in the next year, if the first recommendation of the homeless task force is adopted, the workload will increase over the next couple of years.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN McDONALD verified that the Regional Planning Coalition Homeless Task Force is comprised of members from all regional governments, as well as the school district, and asked why those entities are not contributing to the position currently held by MR. ARENT. Homelessness is a countywide problem. His concern is that focus is being taken away from those areas in desperate need of cleanup. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL indicated that the County has one full time person assigned to the homeless issues. There are additional housing related people in Henderson and North Las Vegas who have been working with the City and putting in a tremendous amount of time and effort to help the Regional Homeless Taskforce. She stated that the City could pursue establishing a regional coordinated effort through this homeless housing trust fund, and those costs would be shared on a regional basis. MAYOR GOODMAN reiterated that it was represented to him that MR. ARENT would continue in this capacity until the homeless issue is resolved. The committee is at a point that it could vote on certain matters and implement the program that MR. ARENT designed. At that time he may be able to be relieved of his responsibilities. It would be a waste of time and effort if MR. ARENT is going to be taken out of the mix at this point. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL emphasized that the transition would happen at an appropriate time and should the Council approve this position, it would not come into play until July.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD discussed with MS. SEGERBLOM the request for the additional Management Analyst. MS. SEGERBLOM explained that currently the Neighborhood Services Department has two Senior Management Analysts. One is in the Administrative Division, who essentially prepares the budget, works in conjunction with the Public Information Office, does all of the administrative work, and other duties that a Deputy Director might do. The other Senior Management Analyst is MARIA CASTILLO-COUCH, who is in charge of the Neighborhood Partners Fund, the City of Las Vegas Senior Council, prepares all the senior activities, and helps in writing the neighborhood newsletter. MS. SEGERBLOM also indicated that there is one part-time staff person at the Belair Office. She is Spanish-speaking and works in the neighborhood. The other staff person that at one time worked in that office, is now working on youth activities. COUNCILMAN McDONALD commented that a commitment was made to keep the office staffed when it first opened. The program was very successful and hopefully it will be again. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the Marshal's Office role should be considered in relationship with the graffiti problem. He requested that MIKE SHELDON, Director, Detention and Enforcement, explore how the Marshals could get involved and arrest these people and bring them into the Municipal Court system to be judged.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN REESE stated that Wards 1, 3 and 5 are surrounded by the redevelopment area, where the City is spending a lot of money on redevelopment in order to entice prospective investors. These areas need help with cleanup and help in regaining the strength that was in older areas. MAYOR GOODMAN asked MS. SEGERBLOM whether studies have been done about the public participating with the City in helping cleanup the graffiti. He asked if any volunteer efforts have been coordinated with the school district. MS. SEGERBLOM replied that they have had a very successful volunteer effort in the past, but it is difficult to work with the youth because of the equipment required. Removing graffiti is not just a matter of using a brush. To do it in a timely and safe manner, a certain type of equipment is used, which might create a safety issue for the youth. Since some graffiti cannot be painted over, it has to be disintegrated from its surface. One problem is the patchwork look that some areas get where only the graffiti is painted instead of the entire wall panel. When the wrong color is used, the area looks worse than the graffiti. She indicated that on many weekends neighborhood cleanups are conducted using volunteers. Currently, the City has only two painters and the turnaround time is not what it used to be.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD stressed the need for additional Code Enforcement Officers to enforce laws that have been established. He outlined some of the laws being violated, such as several families living in one house; abandoned vehicles stored in yards; and out of state landlords who buy apartments, rent them, and leave the state without caring about the condition of those apartments. The City needs to get back to enforcing these violations, and this budget needs to reflect that.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked TOMMY RICKETT, President of the LVCEA (Las Vegas City Employees Association) what is LVCEA'S position as far as using volunteers to help with the graffiti problem. MR. RICKETT replied that he would support this and would coordinate any efforts to see that happen. There are vital assets to having volunteers participate in any type of project with the City, even in a training type capacity. The only drawback for volunteers participating in City activities is safety. The City's liability needs to be protected.

COUNCILMAN REESE pointed out that there are many vacant and boarded up homes in older areas and need to be continually monitored. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY indicated that the older areas might have unsightly homes today, but if this problem is not enforced, tomorrow it might become an issue for the newer parts of the City. It is unfortunate that in the midst of those

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

owners who care about their properties are slumlords that do not care about a neighborhood. Hiring additional Code Enforcement Officers will not help if ordinances to prevent unsightly properties do not hold up in court. He suggested that these ordinances be revisited because they do not have teeth. MS. SEGERBLOM indicated that not only have the number of complaints increased, but the complexity of researching who the out-of-state owners are has increased as well. MAYOR GOODMAN commented that the entire Council agrees that additional Code Enforcement Officers are needed, as well as having laws that will hold up in court once the property owner is cited.

MR. VINCENT pointed out that MS. SEGERBLOM'S department is not the only one that has suffered through the hiring freeze and slow economy. He indicated that the total for the four code enforcement positions would probably be about \$240,000. These four will be set up in the budget, but will be funded by savings from existing vacant positions.

MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC about the Witness Advocate position and if it could be an area of volunteerism. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC replied that volunteers have been utilized in the past. However, this particular position is full-time and requires training in social service or domestic violence advocacy. Currently, this particular advocate assumes 1700 cases a year, and in order to meet those demands the position needs to be staffed at all times.

MR. RICKETT indicated that having participated in both the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and the Fire Department Citizen Academy empowered him to be a better citizen in how the system works. He suggested that a City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Academy be established so that City employees could better understand government and their communities. If the Council would establish a volunteer program, he would help in any way possible.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked staff to explore the possibility of senior citizens getting involved in volunteering. There are many retired professionals that could volunteer their expertise and time. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE acknowledged that citizens express an interest on how they can get involved. She suggested that when Neighborhood Services registers neighborhoods, they provide those interested senior citizens with information on how to be empowered.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. VINCENT stated that opportunities exist to fund the four Code Enforcement Officer positions. COUNCILMAN McDONALD suggested that the Witness Advocate position be a volunteer position since it was being funded from a grant. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and the District Attorney's office should outsource this position. He also indicated that at this time he would not support the Management Analyst position being requested. MR. VINCENT pointed out that it would be acceptable for the Council to decide not to fund those positions and in lieu of that to fund the four Code Enforcement positions. If the Council should decide to make the Victim Advocate position part time, then that could possibly fund one Code Enforcement Officer. Fifteen positions were eliminated and there are opportunities to unfund positions elsewhere and reallocate those resources. There are other vacant positions still unfilled throughout the entire City, and some of them could be eliminated or the Council can let the City Manager bring it back as cost neutral to the budget.

COUNCILMAN BROWN pointed out that he would support prioritizing the Code Enforcement Officer positions with a caveat that it would be a zero net gain on the budget being approved today. In reply to COUNCILMAN BROWN'S query on an update on savings from the hiring freeze, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER HOUCHENS indicated that the City saved approximately \$13 million. The savings attributed to the activities of the freeze and the delayed hiring process is approximately \$7.3 million, and most of it is attributed to the firefighters that were funded and are in the process of being brought on board through the academies. If those are excluded from the numbers, then the savings from the freeze since February of 2001 would be \$5.2 million, of which \$4.8 million is in the current Fiscal Year. He believes that at the end of the year the hiring freeze would probably generate a savings of under \$6 million. He further indicated that as of 5/17/02 there are 147 vacant positions. Of that number, the Position Justification Committee has approved 86 positions for recruitment and for potential hiring, bringing down the vacancy number to 61. Additionally, the delay in the hiring process generates more savings in the general fund.

COUNCILMAN BROWN pointed out that part of the success of the City's entire budget process over the past few years has been the position request that is internally instituted by the City Manager. This year 50% of the departments did not request any new positions and those departments identified efficiencies working with what they have. He clarified with MS. FALDER that the positions listed as temp are those positions hired because of an immediate workload. If a department wants to prolong them, they require going back to the position justification committee and treating them as a new position.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN requested that the City Manager generate the percentages of represented employees versus appointive positions that have been frozen and unfrozen. He also asked for a breakdown of new positions on the City's annual budget between represented and appointive positions for the past four years. He would like this information because he is often asked if there is a bias toward representation versus appointive. Perhaps this information could be brought forward in the form of a City Manager report.

COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that it was brought to his attention that the City adopted a Memorandum of Understanding with the CEA dealing with privatization and that the City will abide by a certain criteria. He requested information on whether this was done internally as a policy or as an agenda item. One budget policy that the City adopted for the past three years is privatization. If the City is looking to expand, be it shopping carts or graffiti or other services, that adopted budget policy, along with an adopted MOU needs to be brought forth. If four Code Enforcement Officers are needed, there are other ways that efficiencies can be created, either with public-private partnerships or outsourcing. He requested that the entire issue of privatization be brought forth as an agenda item or a policy discussion. Privatization can protect the integrity of City jobs, just as much as the perception is that it could take away from those long-term City jobs.

MR. VINCENT explained that there were several position adjustments that staff asked for. Originally in the tentative budget, four Fire Prevention Inspector positions were identified. The fire department has asked that those two positions be exchanged for an Information System Coordinator and a Fire System Analyst for their communication system. At the request of Detention and Enforcement a City Marshal was exchanged for an Animal Control Officer. Originally, a couple of positions in Public Works were unfunded in the tentative budget in lieu of funding two new requests for Engineering Associates. Currently, the positions asked to be eliminated are being exchanged and there is no budgetary impact for that exchange.

MR. VINCENT referred to the adjustments on the Tentative Budget chart regarding miscellaneous reductions in cost primarily driven in the large part by the Public Defender outsourcing to the private sector. The new tentative total is \$365,507,556. He mentioned that the overall shortfall amount is a little higher than what was submitted at the tentative budget, but he is not concerned because it is not a pure operating shortfall because this represents a one-time

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

reduction in the general fund balance to fund the one time adjustment to the firefighters. COUNCILMAN BROWN asked MR. VINCENT if the Council is being asked to increase the fund balance to 12%. MR. VINCENT replied that at the budget workshop he got the sense that the Council was comfortable with 10%. Perhaps this could be looked at next year. Regarding the MOU referred to COUNCILMAN BROWN, MR. VINCENT commented that the City's practice has been to share information with the CEA. In fact, in one instance Field Operations was looking to use an outside contractor to do a painting job and MR. HAUGSNESS' staff was able to come up with a counter proposal that was in fact cheaper than using an outside contractor. In fact, MR. HAUGSNESS' resources were used. Before a decision is made about outsourcing or using an outside contractor, an analysis is made. The MOU only asks that the CEA be given the opportunity to look at what the City would be doing and give them an opportunity to respond or counter with a different proposal.

MR. VINCENT referred to the capital project funding allocation worksheet representing what was discussed at the budget workshop. He pointed out that his staff was able to allocate the residential construction tax to the proper project. COUNCILMAN BROWN pointed out that there is a major storm drain and SID project going on with the Regional Flood Control and the Regional Transportation Commission, and the timing of these projects and the proximity to the Alexander Hualapai Park project is going to push the actual ability to build the park further than originally discussed. Therefore, he asked for Council's support to transfer one million dollars from the Alexander Hualapai Park to the Police Memorial Park Phase II. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY verified with MR. VINCENT that the request of moving one million dollars would come from the restricted funding portion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN indicated that at the budget workshop meeting COUNCILMAN REESE mentioned the potential for partnering with the school district about using their lighted fields. He asked that an additional \$500,000 be transferred from the Alexander Hualapai Park to the ball field lighting. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY asked who would be having this dialogue with the school district. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE replied that the City Manager's Office would initiate that dialogue because it involves various City departments. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY cautioned that before the City enters into any type of agreement with the school district, it must ascertain who would be responsible for the maintenance and the lighting of the fields. He mentioned that when he first joined the Council, a \$900,000 lighting project was approved for the Charles I. West fields, and to this day it has not been established who is responsible for the upkeep of those fields, which are terrible.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

In addition, there have been times when the lights have been left on throughout the night shining into the residential homes facing the school. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE indicated that discussions have been initiated with JOYCE ALDERMAN and DUSTY DICKENS and found that there was a unique agreement with each of these schools. Some of these may have written agreements and others could have been made over a period of time. The City Manager's Office is in the process of inventorying what programming Leisure Services does and what maintenance Field Operations does at which schools, and then try to match up the two lists. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY directed the City Manager's Office to provide information on who is responsible for the maintenance of the fields and lighting at school properties. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that the same situation is happening on City parks where the lights are left on after the event is over. He asked that this be monitored as well. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE replied that the information would be provided within a month.

On behalf of CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC, MAYOR GOODMAN remarked that the Witness Advocate position is very important because it assists victims that have been subjected to violence. Therefore, CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC offered to forego overtime and other benefits at his office in order to pay for the Witness Advocate at least for one year. COUNCILMEN BROWN and McDONALD indicated that that position has not been eliminated.

COUNCILMAN MACK indicated that the Clark County School District approved the construction of a vocational high school with a sports complex to be located west of US 95 near Centennial Parkway. He asked whether \$225,000 of residential construction tax could be used for the vocational high school sports complex. MR. VINCENT replied that it could, but with a caveat that the scope meets the requirement.

MR. VINCENT incorporated the changes into the Capital Project Funding Allocation spreadsheet. He mentioned that instead of using \$1.00 as a placeholder as discussed in the budget workshop, he used dates indicating when first added and last modified.

COUNCILMAN BROWN referred to the Property Tax Rate graph and stated that the graph is very significant because it is an irrefutable indication of how far the City has come in the last five years. He commended the City Manager's Office, Finance and all departments for what they have done in the fastest growing city in the country. He highlighted that in 1994, 1995, 1996 and 1997, the City assessed as much as allowed by law. Today a City of Las Vegas taxpayer is assessed less today for the City portion of their taxes than they were back in 1994. This chart

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

indicates that the City cannot control some of the other assessments, such as Metro, the school district and the County, but the City can control what the City assesses per every \$100 of assessed value. This chart proves what the City's budget policies have accomplished over the past five years. MAYOR GOODMAN commented that the City Council would fight as hard as it can to stop the legislature from trying to have the City impose additional tax on its constituents.

COUNCILMAN MACK requested that the issue of establishing individual budgets for each Council member be revisited, whether it is printing costs or how much time and effort is imposed on individual staff. He also requested information from Leisure Services on whether there is equity amongst all Wards and if equal amounts of monies are being spent for each Ward and for the Mayor's Office as well. He also requested information on what the City spends on publications and subscriptions, whether it is electronic subscriptions, media, newspapers or trade publications. There are too many redundancies. He is aware that both CITY MANAGER VALENTINE and DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL have done a good job at reducing many of these subscription costs, but a harder look should be taken.

MR. VINCENT replied that a budget could be set up for each Ward to track activities. In fact, next year all departments will be using activity numbers to track their costs. It needs to be ascertained that the departments providing those services or support for those activities on behalf of the Ward, would be charged back to that budget. That means having to move the budget from the department to the City Council Wards because new costs are not being created.

COUNCILMAN MACK expressed appreciation to all the different department heads for showing equality to each Council member. He pointed out that neighborhood cleanups are probably not needed in many of the newer areas, but still the department tries to plan the same number of events for each Council Ward. He suggested that those times be allocated to the Wards that need more attention.

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked the status of identifying additional revenue sources coming into the City. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL answered that staff is attempting to get out the vending Request for Proposal (RFP) because that has a significant financial impact on the City. Staff is also in the process of drafting Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to provide

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

advertising assistance for the City on three different fronts. Staff was directed to identify the brand value of the name Las Vegas, therefore that firm would be assisting in doing that. They would also be assisting in identifying and dealing with unsolicited proposals for advertising using City assets. In addition, they will help put together the policies and the process for implementing marketing partnership programs. It is anticipated that by the end of this month an RFQ will be out on the street and the program should be in place by this summer.

COUNCILMAN BROWN asked if there is a suggestion program in place as it relates to efficiencies, and if it has ever been looked at for creating incentives for those people who get involved on how they can save from a dollar to million of dollars. He asked that an updated Manager's briefing be given to the Council within the next few weeks. He verified with CITY MANAGER VALENTINE that a breakdown report by Ward of the number of mailings and postcards has been completed.

COUNCILMAN BROWN commented that it is very important that the vacant positions saved the City approximately \$5.5 million, but that just as important are the things that will save the City \$100 or \$1,000. He is aware that at one time an inventory was taken of how many newspapers are delivered to City Hall everyday. He indicated that today with a click of the mouse anybody could have access to all relevant articles. Does the City need to subscribe to so many newspapers? Regarding subscriptions, he feels that if someone sends an e-mail to the City of Las Vegas public owned computer, then that becomes public information. He would like information on whether the trash he receives via e-mail is a subscription, and if it is, neither he nor the City needs it. He asked that this be provided in the City Manager briefing within the next few weeks.

DEAN FLETHCER, President of City's Firefighters Union, thanked the Council for the approval of the new fire station replacing Station Five. This will improve services to the community. He wished CITY MANAGER VALENTINE farewell and stated that it has been a pleasure working with her. He asked if the ending fund balance was the retro pay due the firefighters union for

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

their contract negotiations. MR. VINCENT explained that this budget brings the general fund balance down to about \$45 million and part of that reduction is to pay for management's estimate of what that retroactive firefighter contract will be for Fiscal Year 2001-2002. MR. FLETCHER remarked that he does not want the citizens to be confused that firefighters, under the collective bargaining have given up the right to strike and the settlement of their contract is retro back to when the contract expired June 23rd of 2001. The City should have been well aware of that in the early budget process.

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE indicated that the four positions in Neighborhood Services are a top priority and staff would have to look at reclassifying or eliminating some of the vacant positions to accommodate these four. COUNCILMAN BROWN verified with CITY MANAGER VALENTINE that the positions would be approved as priorities, but not with any net gain in the number of positions. MR. VINCENT clarified that even though those positions have been approved, they still go through the position review process. In the course of reviewing that, if the City Manager and the departments recommend that this is a high priority, then these positions would be funded with a zero sum gain. MS. FALDER explained that this budget requests only one new Management Analyst. The other referenced Management Analyst is already a position that the Council previously authorized and is currently vacant. There will only be one increase in the Management Analyst for Neighborhood Services.

MAYOR GOODMAN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:11 – 11:01)

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL
AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF: MAY 21, 2002

DEPARTMENT: FINANCE & BUSINESS SERVICES

DIRECTOR: MARK R. VINCENT

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Final Budget

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Discussion and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget as filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 12, 2002 and adoption of the Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Final Budget.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Final Budget, as amended with guidance from City Council.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget

MOTION:

REESE – APPROVED as recommended - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

MAYOR GOODMAN declared the Public Hearing open.

MARK VINCENT, Director, Finance and Business Services, indicated that while there was a significant number of appeals on the assessed value on some of the properties in the redevelopment area, there was significantly more new development going on in the redevelopment areas. As a result, there was a slight growth in the City's tax increment. Staff is not proposing any significant changes over the prior year. The debt service is approximately \$6 million. Housing set aside is 18%, which is approximately \$1.5 million. There is approximately

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MAY 21, 2002

Item 1 – Public hearing and possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2003 City of Las Vegas Final Budget including the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan

MINUTES – Continued:

\$60,000 in administration costs, which is not necessarily salaries and benefits, but other administrative contracts. That gives a positive operation of about \$720,000 more than last year. If this budget is approved as is, it reverts back to the fund balance for the Redevelopment Agency.

There was no further discussion.

No one appeared in opposition.

MAYOR GOODMAN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(11:01 – 11:04

2-684



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
SPECIAL CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL
AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF: MAY 21, 2002**

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

Items raised under this portion of the City Council Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

NONE

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:05 A.M.

Respectfully submitted:

ANGELA CROLLI, DEPUTY CITY CLERK